



CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

AMENDMENT TO
THE WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN
FOR THE SACRAMENTO RIVER AND
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASINS
FOR
DESIGNATING BENEFICIAL USES
AND
NON-REGULATORY CHANGES

STAFF REPORT
and
FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT DOCUMENT



***FINAL REPORT
SEPTEMBER 2002***

State of California
California Environmental Protection Agency
REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

Robert Schneider, Chair
Karl. Longley, Vice Chair
Beverly Alves, Member
Alson Brizard, Member
Christopher Cabaldon, Member
Mark Salvaggio, Member
Cher Kablanow, Member
Robert Fong, Member

Thomas R. Pinkos, Acting Executive Officer

3443 Routier Road, Suite A
Sacramento, California 95827-3003

Phone: (916) 255-3000
CalNet: 8-494-3000

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

AMENDMENT TO
THE WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN
FOR THE SACRAMENTO RIVER AND
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASINS
FOR
DESIGNATING BENEFICIAL USES
AND
NON-REGULATORY CHANGES

STAFF REPORT
and
FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT DOCUMENT

FINAL REPORT
SEPTEMBER 2002

REPORT PREPARED BY:
BETTY YEE
Senior Water Resource Control Engineer
Basin Planning

I. SUMMARY

Staff of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Water Board) proposes for Regional Water Board consideration amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan) to clarify how beneficial uses are designated. In addition, non-regulatory corrections are proposed to remove an inaccurate description of 40 CFR 131.12 (the federal antidegradation policy) and Appendix 38, include references to new State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) policies adopted since 1994, and make other minor edits to correct mistakes and to assure consistency with terminology used in Division 7 of the California Water Code.

II. INTRODUCTION

Basin Plans are the basis for regulatory actions by Regional Water Boards taken to protect waters of the state and assure compliance with the California Water Code. The preparation and adoption of a Basin Plan is required by California Water Code Section 13240 and supported by the federal Clean Water Act (CWA or Act). Section 303 of the CWA requires states to adopt water quality standards which consist of the designated uses of the navigable waters covered by the Act and the water quality criteria (referred to as “water quality objectives” in California) for such waters based upon designated uses. Pursuant to state law, Basin Plans must consist of all of the following (Water Code Section 13240-13244):

- a) beneficial uses to be protected;
- b) water quality objectives;
- c) a program of implementation needed for achieving water quality objectives; and
- d) surveillance and monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

Basin Plans are adopted and amended by the Regional Water Board using a structured process involving peer review, full public participation, state environmental review, and state and federal agency review and approval. Each of the nine Regional Water Boards in California has adopted Basin Plans for its geographic region. The Central Valley Region has adopted two Basin Plans, one for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins and one for the Tulare Lake Basin.

Authority for each Regional Water Board to formulate and adopt Basin Plans and periodically review the plans is provided in Section 13240 of the California Water Code. However, a Basin Plan does not become effective until approved by the State Water Board (Water Code Section 13245), and the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). If the amendment involves adopting or revising a standard which relates to surface water, it falls under federal Clean Water Act jurisdiction and must also be approved by the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) (40 CFR 131.21) before it becomes effective.

Prior to 30 May 2000, surface water quality standards adopted by a state become the applicable water quality standards unless USEPA disapproves them. After 30 May 2000, a state adopted water quality standard becomes the applicable water quality standard only after USEPA approval. State water quality standards are superseded if the USEPA promulgates a more stringent water quality standard for that state, in which case the USEPA promulgated water

quality standard is the applicable water quality standard for purposes of the CWA (65 FR 36046 codified at 40 CFR 131.21). These regulations apply to all surface waters of the state.

The Basin Plan was first adopted in 1975. Triennial reviews were completed in 1984, 1988 and 1999. The Basin Plan was revised and updated in 1989 and 1994. The current edition (Fourth Edition 1998) incorporates two new amendments adopted since 1994. One amendment deals with compliance schedules in permits and the other addresses agricultural surface drainage discharges.

III. PROPOSED REVISIONS

a. Basin Plan Disapprovals

On 26 May 2000, USEPA took action on Basin Plan amendments and revisions adopted by the Regional Water Board between 1989 and 1995. In the action, USEPA disapproved three sections. These sections relate to designation of beneficial uses, applicability of dissolved oxygen objectives to certain Delta waters, and description of the federal antidegradation policy. Staff proposes revisions to the Basin Plan to resolve these disapprovals. However, the dissolved oxygen objectives for Delta waters require further study and will be addressed separately.

Specific concerns and proposed revisions are as follows:

CHAPTER II – PRESENT AND POTENTIAL BENEFICIAL USES

The USEPA determined that the language first incorporated in the Third Edition of the Basin Plan, regarding how beneficial uses were assigned, did not clearly establish which beneficial uses applied to which water bodies because it implied that the Regional Water Board could designate beneficial uses in the permitting process rather than the basin planning process.

It is the intent of the Regional Water Board to establish which beneficial uses apply to waters in the region and that they be adopted through a basin planning process that includes public participation. Therefore, the following sentence is proposed to be added to the end of the “Surface Waters” section on Page II-2.00:

The judgment of the Regional Board on beneficial use evaluations and designations, particularly to change the above designated and assigned beneficial uses, will be conducted in accordance with California Water Code Sections 13240 through 13247 and 40 CFR Part 131 which relate to the adoption and approval of water quality control plans and water quality standards.

CHAPTER IV – IMPLEMENTATION

The USEPA found that the description of the federal antidegradation policy in the Third and Fourth Editions of the Basin Plan was incomplete and misleading. The Regional Water Board agrees. Since this description was only included for information purposes and is non-regulatory, it should be removed to avoid this confusion. The federal policy is still included in the

appendices for informational purposes. The following revision is proposed for Item 2 under “Control Action Considerations of the State Water Board” on Page IV-8.00:

2. State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Water in California.

The State Water Board adopted this policy on 28 October 1968. The policy generally restricts the Regional Water Board and dischargers from reducing the water quality of surface or ground waters even though such a reduction in water quality might still allow the protection of the beneficial uses associated with the water prior to the quality reduction. The goal of the policy is to maintain high quality waters.

Changes in water quality are allowed only if the change is consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State; does not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses; and, does not result in water quality less than that prescribed in water quality control plans or policies.

USEPA water quality standards regulations require each state to adopt an “antidegradation” policy and specify the minimum requirements for the policy (40 CFR 131.12). ~~Resolution No. 68-16 preceded the federal policy and applies to both ground and surface waters. The State Water Board has interpreted State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 to incorporate the federal antidegradation policy. The Regional Water Board implements Resolution No. 68-16 consistent with the federal antidegradation policy. Resolution No. 68-16 applies to both ground and surface waters of the state. Therefore, the federal antidegradation policy must be followed where it is applicable. The federal antidegradation policy applies if a discharge or other activity, which began after 28 November 1975, will lower surface water quality. Application of the federal policy may be triggered by water quality impacts or mass loading impacts to receiving waters. Resolution No. 68-16 is Appendix Item 2; the federal policy is Appendix Item 39.~~

b. Basin Plan Updates

Appendix 38 of the Basin Plan includes a list of the Water Quality Limited Segments in accordance with CWA Section 303(d). This list is not a required element in Basin Plans and is updated biennially by the State Water Board with Regional Water Board recommendations. The current list is outdated and should be removed. Appendix 38 should be removed and the following revision is proposed for the “Water Bodies with Special Water Quality Problems” section on Page IV-6.00:

Water quality management may require the identification and ranking of water bodies with regard to certain quality parameters. Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs) are one example of expressing water quality problems by water bodies. WQLSs are those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate effluent limitations for point sources (40 CFR 130, et seq.).

Additional treatment beyond minimum federal requirements will be imposed on dischargers to WQLSs. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment.

The Regional Water Board's ~~current~~ list of WQLSs is ~~Appendix Item 38~~ updated biennially as required by Clean Water Act Section 303(d). The current list may be obtained by contacting the Regional Water Board office.

The State Water Board adopts statewide plans in accordance with Section 13170 of the California Water Code. "Such plans, when adopted, supersede any regional water quality control plans for the same waters to the extent of any conflict." In March 2000, the State Water Board adopted the "Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California" (SIP). This Policy establishes:

- (1) Implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the USEPA through the National Toxics Rule (40 CFR 131.36) (promulgated on 22 December 1992 and amended on 4 May 1995) and through the California Toxics Rule (40 CFR 131.38) (promulgated on 18 May 2000 and amended on 13 February 2001), and for priority pollutant objectives established by Regional Water Boards in their basin plans;
- (2) Monitoring requirements for 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalents; and
- (3) Chronic toxicity control provisions. In addition, this Policy includes special provisions for certain types of discharges and factors that could affect the application of other provisions in this Policy. Reference to this policy should be added to the Basin Plan by adding the following to the "Control Action Considerations of the State Water Board" section on Page IV-10.00:

15. Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California" (a.k.a. State Implementation Plan or SIP)

In March 2000, the State Water Board adopted the SIP in Resolution No. 2000-015. This Policy establishes:

- (1) Implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) through the National Toxics Rule (40 CFR 131.36) (promulgated on 22 December 1992 and amended on 4 May 1995) and through the California Toxics Rule (40 CFR 131.38) (promulgated on 18 May 2000 and amended on 13 February 2001), and for priority pollutant objectives established by Regional Water Boards in their basin plans;*
- (2) Monitoring requirements for 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalents; and*
- (3) Chronic toxicity control provisions. In addition, this Policy includes special provisions for certain types of discharges and factors that could affect the application of other provisions in this Policy.*

Since release of the Fourth Edition of the Basin Plan, regulations for solid waste management have been moved to 27 CCR, Division 2, Subdivision 1 and combined with solid waste management regulations of the Integrated Waste Management Board. Water Board regulations for hazardous waste and regulations cited in State Water Board Resolution No. 92-49, *Policies*

and Procedures for Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of Discharges under Water Code Section 13304, remain in 23 CCR, Division 3, Chapter 15. To reflect this update, the following revisions are proposed:

Page IV-4.00, “Mineral Exploration and Extraction” section, last sentence of third paragraph:

... Mining waste management facilities and associated mining operations are regulated through the issuance of waste discharger requirements under the State and Regional Water Boards’ ~~Discharges of Waste to Land~~ hazardous and solid waste regulatory program (Title 23, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Division 3, Chapter 15/Title 27 CCR).

Page IV-5.00, first paragraph under the “Hazardous and Non-Hazardous Waste Disposal” section:

... If the concentrations of ~~pollutants~~ constituents in the land-discharged waste are sufficiently high to prevent the waste from being classified as "inert waste" under ~~23 CCR, Section 252427~~ CCR, Section 20230, discharges of such wastes to waste management units require long term containment or active treatment following the discharge in order to prevent waste or waste constituents from migrating to and impairing the beneficial uses of waters of the State.

Page IV-5.00, third paragraph under the “Hazardous and Non-Hazardous Waste Disposal” section:

... Recent monitoring efforts under the State and Regional Water Boards’ Title 23, CCR Division 3, Chapter 15/Title 27 CCR and SWAT programs have revealed that discharges of municipal solid wastes to unlined and single clay lined landfills have resulted in ground water degradation and pollution by volatile organic constituents (VOCs) and other waste constituents.

Page IV-6.00, last paragraph of the “Hazardous and Non-Hazardous Waste Disposal” section:

... ~~The State Water Board is in the process of developing revised regulations under 23 CCR, Division 3, Chapter 15, Discharges of Waste to Land, to fully implement water quality related portions of the RCRA Subtitle D federal regulations.~~

Page IV-10.00, first item under the “Programs” section:

1. Discharges of Hazardous Waste to Land, California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 15 and Consolidated Regulations for Treatment, Storage, Processing or Disposal of Solid Waste, California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1

Title 23, CCR, Division 3 Chapter 15 and Title 27 CCR includes regulations governing discharges of hazardous and solid waste to land for treatment, storage, or disposal.

Page IV-18.00, first paragraph under Item 9:

The Regional Water Board's strategy for managing contaminated sites is guided by several important principles, which are based on Water Code Sections 13000 and 13304, the Title 23, CCR, Division 3, Chapter 15/Title 27 CCR regulations and State Water Board Resolution Nos. 68-16 and 92-49:

Page IV-18.00, first paragraph under Item 9a:

The Regional Water Board will require conformance with the provisions of State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 in all cases and will require conformance with applicable or relevant provisions of 23 CCR, Division 3, Chapter 15 and 27 CCR, Division 2, Subdivision 1 to the extent feasible.

Page IV-21.00, first paragraph under Item 9l:

Where leachable/mobile concentrations of constituents of concern remain on-site in concentrations which threaten water quality, the Regional Water Board will require implementation of applicable provisions of Title 23, CCR, Division 3 Chapter 15/Title 27 CCR. Relevant provisions of Title 23, CCR, Division 3 Chapter 15/Title 27 CCR which may not be directly applicable, but which address situations similar to those addressed at the cleanup site will be implemented to the extent feasible, in conformance with Title 23, CCR, Section 2511(d)/27 CCR, Section 20090(d). This may include, but is not limited to, surface or subsurface barriers or other containment systems, ~~pollutant~~ waste immobilization, toxicity reduction, and financial assurances.

c. Basin Plan Edits

The following revision is proposed for consistency with the California Water Code: Page III-1.00, second paragraph of the “first point”, first sentence:

Changes to the objectives can also occur because of new scientific information on the effects of specific constituents ~~water contaminants~~.

The use of the designation “MUN” in the Bacteria objective for ground water is the same as its use in the Chemical Constituents and the Radioactivity objectives; therefore, the wording of the bacteria objective should be revised to be consistent and to clarify that the use of “MUN” is a beneficial use designation and not a description of an existing use pattern. The following revision is proposed for Page III-9.00, Bacteria objective:

In ground waters ~~used for~~ designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) the most probable number of coliform organisms over any seven-day period shall be less than 2.2/100 ml.

Page IV-5.00, second column, end of paragraph continued from previous column:

... The Regional Water Board is responsible for enforcing this Act under the authority of the Health and Safety Code, Section 25208 et seq. (See page ~~IV-13~~IV-11 for further description).

d. Mandates for Basin Plan Amendments

The Regional Water Board must comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) when amending the Basin Plan. The planning process for Basin Plans has been certified by the California Secretary of Resources as a regulatory program pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.5. CEQA Guidelines § 15251(g). Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.5(c), the Basin Plan planning process is exempt from the provisions of the CEQA that relate to preparation of Environmental Impact Reports and Negative Declarations. In lieu of compliance with those provisions of CEQA, this Staff Report satisfies the requirements of State Water Resources Control Board Regulations for Implementation of CEQA, Exempt Regulatory Programs, which are found in the California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 27, Article 6, beginning at Section 3775.

The purpose of this staff report is to present alternatives and staff recommendations for amending the Basin Plan and to provide a summary of the necessity for the proposed regulatory provisions. The potential for environmental impacts, which would occur as a result of the proposed regulatory revisions, is addressed in the Environmental Checklist (Appendix 1) and in the discussion of the rationale for why an individual alternative was selected over others. No significant impacts are expected as a result of the proposed regulatory revisions.

The major purpose of the proposed regulatory and non-regulatory revisions is to respond to the USEPA concerns and to update the Basin Plan.

IV. ALTERNATIVES

1. *No action.*

If the Regional Water Board does not revise the Basin Plan, it will continue to be inconsistent with federal regulations and contain outdated language. This will lead to confusion in implementing water quality standards and identifying applicable policies. The Third Edition of the Basin Plan was reformatted so that updates could be easily included. To take no action would be inconsistent with the purpose of reformatting the Basin Plan. This will also lead to wasted time and resources from stakeholders attempting to comply with an outdated Basin Plan.

2. *Adopt proposed regulatory revisions only*

The regulatory revisions only affect beneficial uses for surface waters. If this alternative were adopted, outdated policies would continue to be included as if they were current policies. The Third Edition of the Basin Plan was reformatted so that updates could be easily included. To leave out the non-regulatory updates would mislead stakeholders and lead to wasted time and resources from stakeholders attempting to comply with the outdated policies.

3. *Adopt proposed regulatory and non-regulatory revisions*

By adopting the proposed revisions, the Regional Water Board would make the region's water quality standards consistent with federal regulations. In addition, the Basin Plan will contain the current policies and inform stakeholders and the public of current water quality requirements.

4. Adopt different regulatory language to clarify how the Regional Water Board designates beneficial uses

An alternative option to clarifying that beneficial use designations will occur through a basin planning process is to amend the Basin Plan to allow the Regional Water Board to designate beneficial uses in permits. However, this is inconsistent with federal regulations (40 CFR 131.10). NPDES permits with beneficial uses different than those adopted in a basin planning process would not be accepted by USEPA.

V. RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE (#3)

Revise Basin Plan sections as follows:

CHAPTER II – PRESENT AND POTENTIAL BENEFICIAL USES

The following sentence is proposed to be added to the end of the “Surface Waters” section on Page II-2.00:

The judgment of the Regional Board on beneficial use evaluations and designations, particularly to change the above designated and assigned beneficial uses, will be conducted in accordance with California Water Code Sections 13240 through 13247 and 40 CFR Part 131 which relate to the adoption and approval of water quality control plans and water quality standards.

CHAPTER III – WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

The following revision is proposed for Page III-1.00, second paragraph of the “first point”, first sentence:

Changes to the objectives can also occur because of new scientific information on the effects of specific constituents ~~*water contaminants.*~~

The following revision is proposed for the “Bacteria” objective on Page III-9.00:

In ground waters ~~used for~~ designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) the most probable number of coliform organisms over any seven-day period shall be less than 2.2/100 ml.

CHAPTER IV – IMPLEMENTATION

The following revision is proposed for Page IV-4.00, “Mineral Exploration and Extraction” section, last sentence of third paragraph:

... Mining waste management facilities and associated mining operations are regulated through the issuance of waste discharger requirements under the State and Regional Water Boards' ~~Discharges of Waste to Land~~ hazardous and solid waste regulatory program (Title 23, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Division 3, Chapter 15/Title 27 CCR).

The following revision is proposed for Page IV-5.00, first paragraph under the “Hazardous and Non-Hazardous Waste Disposal” section:

... If the concentrations of ~~pollutants~~ constituents in the land-discharged waste are sufficiently high to prevent the waste from being classified as "inert waste" under ~~23 CCR, Section 252427 CCR, Section 20230~~, discharges of such wastes to waste management units require long term containment or active treatment following the discharge in order to prevent waste or waste constituents from migrating to and impairing the beneficial uses of waters of the State.

The following revision is proposed for Page IV-5.00, third paragraph under the “Hazardous and Non-Hazardous Waste Disposal” section:

... Recent monitoring efforts under the State and Regional Water Boards' Title 23, CCR Division 3, Chapter 15/Title 27 CCR and SWAT programs have revealed that discharges of municipal solid wastes to unlined and single clay lined landfills have resulted in ground water degradation and pollution by volatile organic constituents (VOCs) and other waste constituents.

The following revision is proposed for Page IV-6.00, last paragraph of the “Hazardous and Non-Hazardous Waste Disposal” section:

... ~~The State Water Board is in the process of developing revised regulations under 23 CCR, Division 3, Chapter 15, Discharges of Waste to Land, to fully implement water quality related portions of the RCRA Subtitle D federal regulations.~~

The following revision is proposed for the “Water Bodies with Special Water Quality Problems” section on Page IV-6.00:

Water quality management may require the identification and ranking of water bodies with regard to certain quality parameters. Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs) are one example of expressing water quality problems by water bodies. WQLSs are those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate effluent limitations for point sources (40 CFR 130, et seq.).

Additional treatment beyond minimum federal requirements will be imposed on dischargers to WQLSs. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment.

The Regional Water Board's ~~current~~ list of WQLSs is Appendix Item 38 updated biennially as required by Clean Water Act Section 303(d). The current list may be obtained by contacting the Regional Water Board office.

The following revision is proposed for Item 2 under “Control Action Considerations of the State Water Board” on Page IV-8.00:

2. State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Water in California.

The State Water Board adopted this policy on 28 October 1968. The policy generally restricts the Regional Water Board and dischargers from reducing the water quality of surface or ground waters even though such a reduction in water quality might still allow the protection of the beneficial uses associated with the water prior to the quality reduction. The goal of the policy is to maintain high quality waters.

Changes in water quality are allowed only if the change is consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State; does not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses; and, does not result in water quality less than that prescribed in water quality control plans or policies.

USEPA water quality standards regulations require each state to adopt an “antidegradation” policy and specify the minimum requirements for the policy (40 CFR 131.12). ~~Resolution No. 68-16 preceded the federal policy and applies to both ground and surface waters.~~ The State Water Board has interpreted State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 to incorporate the federal antidegradation policy. The Regional Water Board implements Resolution No. 68-16 consistent with the federal antidegradation policy. Resolution No. 68-16 applies to both ground and surface waters of the state. Therefore, the federal antidegradation policy must be followed where it is applicable. ~~The federal antidegradation policy applies if a discharge or other activity, which began after 28 November 1975, will lower surface water quality. Application of the federal policy may be triggered by water quality impacts or mass loading impacts to receiving waters.~~ Resolution No. 68-16 is Appendix Item 2; the federal policy is Appendix Item 39.

The following is proposed to be added to the “Control Action Considerations of the State Water Board” section on Page IV-10.00:

15. Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California” (a.k.a. State Implementation Plan or SIP)

In March 2000, the State Water Board adopted the SIP in Resolution No. 2000-015. This Policy establishes:

- (1) Implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) through the National Toxics Rule (40 CFR 131.36) (promulgated on 22 December 1992 and amended on 4 May 1995) and through the California Toxics Rule (40 CFR 131.38) (promulgated on 18 May 2000 and amended on 13 February 2001), and for priority pollutant objectives established by Regional Water Boards in their basin plans;*
- (2) Monitoring requirements for 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalents; and*

- (3) Chronic toxicity control provisions. In addition, this Policy includes special provisions for certain types of discharges and factors that could affect the application of other provisions in this Policy.

The following revision is proposed for Page IV-10.00, first item under the “Programs” section:

1. Discharges of Hazardous Waste to Land, California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 15 and Consolidated Regulations for Treatment, Storage, Processing or Disposal of Solid Waste, California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1

Title 23, CCR, Division 3 Chapter 15 and Title 27 CCR includes regulations governing discharges of hazardous and solid waste to land for treatment, storage, or disposal.

The following revision is proposed for Page IV-18.00, first paragraph under Item 9:

The Regional Water Board's strategy for managing contaminated sites is guided by several important principles, which are based on Water Code Sections 13000 and 13304, the Title 23, CCR, Division 3, Chapter 15/Title 27 CCR regulations and State Water Board Resolution Nos. 68-16 and 92-49:

The following revision is proposed for Page IV-18.00, first paragraph under Item 9a:

The Regional Water Board will require conformance with the provisions of State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 in all cases and will require conformance with applicable or relevant provisions of 23 CCR, Division 3, Chapter 15 and 27 CCR, Division 2, Subdivision 1 to the extent feasible.

The following revision is proposed for Page IV-21.00, first paragraph under Item 9l:

Where leachable/mobile concentrations of constituents of concern remain on-site in concentrations which threaten water quality, the Regional Water Board will require implementation of applicable provisions of Title 23, CCR, Division 3 Chapter 15/Title 27 CCR. Relevant provisions of Title 23, CCR, Division 3 Chapter 15/Title 27 CCR which may not be directly applicable, but which address situations similar to those addressed at the cleanup site will be implemented to the extent feasible, in conformance with Title 23, CCR, Section 2511(d)/27 CCR, Section 20090(d). This may include, but is not limited to, surface or subsurface barriers or other containment systems, ~~pollutant~~ waste immobilization, toxicity reduction, and financial assurances.

APPENDIX

Appendix 38 is proposed to be removed.

VI. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

1. CEQA and Economic Considerations

The Basin Planning process has been certified by the California Secretary of Resources as functionally equivalent to the preparation of an initial study, a negative declaration, or environmental impact report (EIR) pursuant to CEQA. In lieu of these documents, however, the Regional Water Board is required to prepare the following: the Basin Plan amendment; an Environmental Checklist that identifies potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of the Basin Plan amendment; and a staff report that describes the proposed amendment, reasonable alternatives, and mitigation measures to minimize any significant adverse environmental impacts identified in the Checklist. The Basin Plan amendment, Environmental Checklist, and staff report together are functionally equivalent to an initial study, negative declaration, or EIR.

Based on the Environmental Checklist (attached to this report), staff concludes that there would be no potentially significant adverse impacts on the environment caused by adoption of this Basin Plan amendment.

The proposed revision to the bacteria objective for ground water clarifies the objective and is consistent with current permitting practices. Dischargers will not be subject to additional requirements because of this revision so there are no expected economic costs.

VII. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Water Board approve the proposed Basin Plan amendment.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

The planning process for Basin Plans has been certified by the California Secretary of Resources as a regulatory program pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.5. CEQA Guidelines § 15251(g). Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.5(c), the Basin Plan planning process is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that relate to preparation of Environmental Impact Reports and Negative Declarations. This attachment to the proposed basin plan amendment satisfies the requirements of State Water Resources Control Board Regulations for Implementation of CEQA, Exempt Regulatory Programs, which are found in the California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 27, Article 6, beginning at section 3775. Section 3777 requires preparation of:

- an environmental checklist; and
- a written report containing a brief description of the proposed activity or project, reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity, and mitigation measures to minimize any significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed activity.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Valley Region, Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan) designates beneficial uses of waterbodies, establishes water quality objectives for the protection of these beneficial uses, and outlines a plan of implementation for maintaining and enhancing water quality.

The proposed Basin Plan amendment will revise the language in the beneficial uses chapter to clearly state that the Regional Water Board will use a basin planning process to designate any beneficial uses.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Project Title:

Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins to Update the Basin Plan.

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, 3443 Routier Road, Suite A, Sacramento, CA 95827-3003

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Betty Yee, Senior Water Resource Control Engineer, (916) 255-0743.

4. Project Location:

Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, 3443 Routier Road, Suite A, Sacramento, CA 95827-3003

6. General Plan Designation:

Not applicable

7. Zoning:

Not applicable

8. Description of Project:

Basin Plan amendment to clearly state that a basin planning process will be used to designate or change designated beneficial uses.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Not applicable.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

State Water Resources Control Board
Office of Administrative Law
United States Environmental Protection Agency

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental resource categories identified below are analyzed herein to determine whether the Proposed Project would result in adverse impacts to any of these resources. None of the categories below are checked because the Proposed Project is not expected to result in "significant or potentially significant impacts" to any of these resources.

Aesthetics	Biological Resources
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Mineral Resources
Public Services	Utilities/Service Systems
Agriculture Resources	Cultural Resources
Hydrology/Water Quality	Noise
Recreation	Mandatory Findings of Significance
Air Quality	Geology/Soils
Land Use Planning	Transportation/Traffic

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the Proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- ☐ I find that although the Proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made by or agreed to by the Project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the Proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the Proposed Project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the Proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the Proposed Project, nothing further is required.

_____ Signature	_____ Date
_____ Printed name	_____ For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to Project’s like the one involved (e.g., the Project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on Project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the Project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a Project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as Project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than

significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analysis,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the Project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a Project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

This Environmental Checklist has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA relating to certified regulatory programs.

IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
I. AESTHETICS Would the Project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the Project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control the District may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the Project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the Project:				

IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly, or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulators, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the Project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource of site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the Project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure,, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the Project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the Project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which results in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the Project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the Project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XI. NOISE – Would the Project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the Project?				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XIV. RECREATION

a) Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the Project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio to roads, or congestion at intersections?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion/management agency for designated roads or highways?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the Project?

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number of restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probably future projects)?				
c) Does the Project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of making impact determinations, potential impacts were determined to be significant if the Proposed Project or its alternatives would result in changes in environmental condition that would, either directly or indirectly, cause a substantial loss of habitat or substantial degradation of water quality or other resources.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Each resource category of the Environmental Checklist is supported by the following discussions and source information, as cited.

Aesthetics

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to aesthetics.

Agricultural Resources

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to agricultural resources.

Air Quality

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to air quality.

Biological Resources

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to biological resources.

Cultural Resources

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to cultural resources.

Geology and Soils

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to geology and soils.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to hazards and hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to hydrology and water quality.

Land Use and Planning

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to land use and planning.

Mineral Resources

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to mineral resources.

Noise

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to noise.

Population and Housing

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to population and housing.

Public Services

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to public services.

Recreation

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should have no impact on recreation.

Transportation/Traffic

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should result in no impact to transportation or traffic.

Utilities and Service Systems

The Proposed Project would clarify that designating or changing the designation of beneficial uses will be conducted in a basin planning process. The Proposed Project will clarify the Basin Plan to reflect federally required processes and should have no impact on utilities or service systems.

THE NO PROJECT/CURRENT BASIN PLAN ALTERNATIVE

This Staff Report concludes that the Proposed Project will not cause any potentially significant impacts. Therefore, there are no mitigation measures or alternative that could reduce or avoid significant impacts. This report analyzes a No Project/Current Basin Plan Alternative to provide additional context for decision-making parties. The No Project/Current Basin Plan Alternative is environmentally equivalent to the Proposed Project.

The No Project/Current Basin Plan Alternative characterizes what would happen if the Proposed Project (i.e., updating the basin plan to reflect federal regulations and current policies) is not approved and implemented. Under the No Project/Current Basin Plan Alternative, there will be no impacts but the Basin Plan would not be consistent with federal regulations and would be subject to USEPA promulgation of revised standards.

RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE

Based on the analysis of the Proposed Project and the No Project/Current Basin Plan Alternative presented above, Regional Water Board staff recommend approval and implementation of the Proposed Project.

DE MINIMUS FINDING

The Regional Water Board staff, after consideration of the evidence, recommend that the Regional Water Board find that the proposed project has no potential for adverse effect, either individually or cumulatively on wildlife.